

APPROVED
MINUTES
NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
FORT LAUDERDALE
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
JULY 27, 2016 – 3:30 P.M.

Cumulative Attendance
May 2016 - April 2017

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Steve Lucas, Chair	P	3	0
Ella Phillips, Vice Chair	P	2	1
Jessie Adderley (arr. 3:44)	P	3	0
Leann Barber	A	2	1
Sonya Burrows	P	3	0
Ron Centamore	P	3	0
Alan Gabriel	A	2	1
Mickey Hinton	P	3	0
John Hooper	P	2	1
Dylan Lagi	P	3	0
Steffen Lue	A	1	2
Jacqueline Reed (arr. 3:57)	P	2	1
Scott Strawbridge	P	3	0
John Wilkes	A	2	1

Currently there are 14 appointed members to the Board, which means 8 would constitute a quorum.

It was noted that a quorum was present at the meeting.

Staff

Jonathan Brown, Northwest CRA Manager
Bob Wojcik, Planner II
Sandra Doughlin, DSD/ECR
Robyn Chiarelli, Executive Director, Downtown Fort Lauderdale TMA
Karen Mendrala, Department of Transportation and Mobility
Kevin Walford, Department of Transportation and Mobility
Mona Laventure, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

Motion made by Vice Chair Phillips, seconded by Ms. Burrows, to send a communication to the CRA Board informing them that the Advisory Board has strongly requested greater transparency in the CRA budget process so they can make educated,

informed decisions about the budget. The Advisory Board also requests a full breakdown of the CRA budget. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chair Lucas called the meeting to order at 3:38 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

II. Approval of Minutes from June 14, 2016 Special Meeting & June 22, 2016 Regular Meeting

As some Board members had not received the June 14, 2016 and June 22, 2016 minutes, approval was deferred until the next scheduled meeting.

III. Cancellation of Next Month's Meeting – NPF CRA Board

Mr. Brown advised that the CRA budget would be discussed both at today's meeting and once more in September before it is presented to the City Commission for approval. He added that funding requests are also scheduled for upcoming meetings, but may be placed on the September Agenda if the Board wishes. It was determined that the Board would reach a decision on postponement by the end of today's meeting.

IV. Sun Trolley – TMA

Chair Lucas introduced Karen Mendrala and Kevin Walford, representing the Department of Transportation and Mobility, and Robyn Chiarelli, Executive Director of the Downtown Fort Lauderdale Transportation Management Association (TMA), which operates the Sun Trolley.

Ms. Mendrala explained that the request is for operating funds for the Sun Trolley routes located inside the Northwest CRA. These include the Neighborhood Link, the Northwest Link, and the Downtown Link. The fiscal year (FY) 2015-16 CRA budget includes a line item for this funding, which was approved by the Board; however, it was necessary to ensure that the CRA Plan may include this activity, and the Board wished to have additional discussion of the Item.

Ms. Mendrala continued that the TMA has requested funding for a portion of the Downtown Link that connects the CRA to the Downtown area. These three routes have the highest ridership within the Sun Trolley's system.

Chair Lucas requested clarification that the Board may legally provide funds to the Sun Trolley under CRA guidelines. Mr. Brown confirmed this.

Mr. Strawbridge recalled discussion at a previous meeting of amending the CRA Plan in order to fund projects such as the Ambassador Program or the Sun Trolley. Mr. Brown explained that the current CRA budget includes dollars for both the TMA and the Ambassador Program. He advised that funding may not be spent on any item not included in the CRA Plan, which is not the same as budgeting those dollars.

Ms. Mendrala clarified that the TMA is requesting that funds be spent in both the current fiscal year and the next fiscal year. The funding would apply to the entire fiscal year now that the CRA Plan has been amended.

Ms. Adderley arrived at 3:44 p.m.

Mr. Strawbridge expressed concern with the governance issues affecting the CRA, pointing out that he did not feel that the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) would find the funding of this and other Items to be acceptable. Mr. Brown responded that these plans may be made retroactive.

Mr. Centamore also recommended caution in proceeding with retroactive funding, stating that he did not find it possible to provide funding for an Item during the time before the CRA Plan was amended to include that Item. Ms. Mendrala observed that the Sun Trolley has been operating throughout the current fiscal year using funds from City and other sources; accepting CRA dollars at this point would serve to relieve some City funds from this use.

Chair Lucas suggested that the funding request could be separated into funding for the current fiscal year and funding for the next year, which would allow the Board to table funding for the current year based on their concerns.

Ms. Burrows recalled that another issue is the provision of a route that extends down Sistrunk Boulevard. Ms. Mendrala replied that the TMA is reviewing its Transit Master Plan with a consultant in order to reconsider all existing routes. She also noted that funding restrictions state that TMA routes may not conflict with Broward County Transit (BCT) routes. BCT does not have issues with a TMA route that includes Sistrunk Boulevard, which means it is possible that the routes within the CRA may be restructured when the Master Plan is complete.

Mr. Brown confirmed that the TMA's proposal is eligible for funding in accordance with the CRA Plan. Vice Chair Phillips stated that she did not feel confident that an extension on the Sistrunk Corridor would be planned, as the Board has requested this extension in the past.

Ms. Chiarelli explained that the TMA is a private nonprofit entity with a budget of approximately \$2.5 million, which draws from City, State, and federal sources as well as

private sponsorships and fare box revenue. Without CRA funding, the TMA would have to discuss the use of reserve funds to afford operation of the Downtown Link.

Ms. Reed arrived at 3:57 p.m.

Mr. Centamore asked if the routes operating within the CRA have been funded through the present date. Ms. Mendrala confirmed this. She added that the TMA consultant is expected to recommend modified routes in September or October 2016. Mr. Brown pointed out, however, that if the TMA must budget funds from another source in its FY2016-17 budget, CRA funds may not supplant them. He recommended that the Board make a recommendation at today's meeting so the TMA may proceed with alternative budgeting if necessary.

Mr. Strawbridge commented that in the past, the Board has funded these three TMA routes with CRA funds, whether or not it was allowable at the time. He asked if the other Board members felt it was equitable to provide CRA funds for their operation, which in turn allows monies from other funding sources to be used for routes outside the CRA. He asked how much funding is provided by the Downtown Development Authority (DDA).

Ms. Chiarelli replied that the DDA provides \$24,000 in funding, and pointed out that in FY17 the TMA is facing a \$300,000 budget shortfall throughout its system, even if funds are provided from the CRA. Cuts in funding may result in cutbacks to service within the CRA and elsewhere. The CRA does not pay the full cost of all miles operated within the CRA: the TMA also pursues grants that assist with funding these routes, as well as County, State, and federal funds.

Ms. Chiarelli explained that funding for the routes within the CRA comes from other sources as well, including the City. Mr. Strawbridge emphasized the need for the Board to be aware of other funding partners for these routes, pointing out that the DDA makes a lesser contribution than the CRA for the Downtown Link. He concluded that he was not certain the CRA's dollars are being equitably spent or that the TMA's funding of its routes within the CRA are sufficiently transparent. Ms. Chiarelli stated that she can provide information on per-route funding.

Mr. Strawbridge continued that during his service on the Board, the Sun Trolley's funding requests have quadrupled, although no route has been extended down Sistrunk Boulevard. He asked why the request has grown without demonstrable changes in service. Ms. Mendrala pointed out that an additional trolley now serves the Northwest Link, which was served by only one vehicle at an earlier time. New vehicles have also been added to the Neighborhood Link and are planned for the Downtown Link.

Mr. Brown advised that the Board should consider whether or not there is a benefit to operating the Sun Trolley within the CRA. Chair Lucas clarified that the Board members

wished to know the other funding sources for routes within the CRA, as well as the amount of funds they provide, in addition to more work on the possibility of a Sistrunk Boulevard extension. He noted that this will mean the TMA must come before the Board again in August, as the budget goes before the City Commission in September.

It was decided that the next Board meeting would be held on August 24, 2016 to discuss this and other topics. Ms. Burrows pointed out, however, that the TMA would not have the results of its consultant's study available until after the August meeting. Mr. Strawbridge asserted that the primary issues at stake are fiscal governance and equity of funding and service to CRA residents. He indicated that the Board's concern is to align its funding of the TMA with the needs of the community.

V. Wave Update

Chair Lucas advised that this Item will be deferred to a later date; however, he recalled that a presentation was made at a previous meeting regarding a study of the proposed Wave Modern Streetcar extension. He noted that a recent report stated that the Wave could be extended down Sistrunk Boulevard, but greater density would be required to make this extension. He proposed that a full update be presented to the Board at its August meeting to discuss how much density would be necessary for the extension. Ms. Burrows pointed out that the study was intended to address ridership rather than density, as the lack of density had already been determined.

Chris Wren, Executive Director of the Downtown Development Authority (DDA), advised that he and the City had discussed the possibility of extending the Wave down Sistrunk Boulevard, which was part of the DDA's original plan for a circulator with extensions to Sistrunk Boulevard as well as the airport and seaport. The City studied the potential Sistrunk Boulevard connection through a grant funded by the Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). The conclusion of this study was that there would not be enough ridership for an extension. Mr. Wren suggested a pilot program, in which the Wave is extended down Sistrunk Boulevard to 7th Avenue or 9th Avenue to determine if greater density is necessary to result in sufficient ridership.

Mr. Wren continued that the consultant determined there would not be enough future ridership with the existing density, and noted that the Northwest area relies heavily on transit but lacks new transit opportunities. He has asked that the City review the study to determine what changes, including land use, would be necessary to increase ridership in the area.

The following Item was taken out of order on the Agenda.

VIII. Ambassador Program vs Policing Initiatives – Jonathan Brown, NPF CRA Manager, and Bob Wojcik, Planner III, NPF CRA

Mr. Wren recalled that when the proposed Ambassador Program came before the Board at an earlier time, it was approved for funding; however, because the CRA Plan has been amended, it is being presented once more. He noted that backup materials on the program were provided to the Board members.

Although the DDA Board has directed Mr. Wren to request Flagler Village security ambassadors, he advised that both City Staff and community members are considering the program. He has reached out to various segments of the Northwest community to make individuals aware that this is a community discussion.

Mr. Wren recalled that in previous discussions of the Ambassador Program, the possibility of extending the program as far as the African American Research Library and Cultural Center if funds were allocated. The program is requesting an allocation of up to \$400,000 from the Board for a mixture of security ambassadors and Police, which would extend from Flagler Village to the African American Research Library. This would be a pilot program. The Downtown Ambassador Program would be folded into this effort so there is a single unified program.

Mr. Brown observed that there are benefits to implementing both the Ambassador Program and policing initiatives; he noted, however, that CRA funding could only extend as far as its western boundary, which would not include the African American Research Library. These initiatives would provide greater security throughout the entire CRA rather than only in specific areas, and ambassadors would be available in "hot spots" within the district. In other portions of the CRA, he noted that policing would be preferential to the Ambassador Program.

Mr. Centamore requested additional information on how the Ambassador Program and policing initiatives would be divided with regard to payment. Mr. Wren acknowledged that this has not yet been determined, and that the cost of Police Officers would be significantly higher than the cost of ambassadors. Ambassadors are also instructed to avoid confrontations in certain parts of the CRA, which would mean that Police Officers would be necessary in these areas.

Mr. Brown added that he has approached the CRA's District Commissioner regarding this program and the Commissioner is in favor of it if grant funds are awarded to cover the cost of Police Officers. He recalled that the overtime necessary to engage off-duty Police Officers would be between \$90,000 and \$100,000 to cover 2000 hours per year, with separate costs for vehicles. No CRA dollars would be necessary to pay for Officers already assigned to the area.

Mr. Strawbridge noted that resources would remain focused south of Broward Boulevard, with boundaries extending as far as 4th Street. The request of the CRA would be for \$200,000 for the Ambassador Program and an additional \$100,000 for

Police Officers. He was not certain this would provide sufficient assistance to the Northwest community.

Chair Lucas observed that another issue is the leveraging of infrastructure and technology. Mr. Strawbridge agreed, asserting that the current plan is not sustainable, as \$6 million of the CRA's \$9 million budget is already committed.

Mr. Wren stated that he has discussed the proposal with the Mayor and the City Commissioners, not all of whom are in agreement about the program at present. He suggested that he could bring more accurate figures back to a subsequent Board meeting, as it has not yet been determined that the program the City Commission may want is the same as the program the Board would like to see.

Mr. Wren continued that the Ambassador Program has gone through adjustments during the past eight months, as it began with half the current number of ambassadors. These changes included modifying shifts in order to be less predictable. He explained that he was not certain of how the program might evolve in a different area, such as west of Flagler Village. The ambassadors have been successful at working closely with the existing Police force.

Mr. Wren noted that seven "hot spots" in the CRA have been identified in the CRA, and the proposed pilot program would slowly build up until there is a presence in each of them. The full requested amount would not be spent at the beginning of the program. The current Ambassador Program costs \$200,000. He added that the DDA does not experience a cash flow similar to that of government, which means the processing of invoices can take longer. The DDA would keep the Board apprised of how funds are spent on the program.

Mr. Brown noted that because the cost of the program would be greater than \$25,000, it would be necessary to put forth a request for proposal (RFP) to find an agency to administer the project. Mr. Wren stated that he would like the program to be administered through the building in which Mr. Brown's office is located. He was confident that the Police Department would work well with the Ambassador Program.

Mr. Strawbridge commented that the Board has been provided with multiple crime statistics for the CRA, while the DDA has only anecdotal information on the success of the Ambassador Program. He recommended that the DDA provide statistical information on the program's success, as they are asking the CRA to make a recurring investment in it. Mr. Wren explained that the program is currently undergoing staffing changes, which was why only anecdotal evidence was available at present.

Ms. Reed requested additional information on the DDA's experience in hiring members of the community to serve as ambassadors. Mr. Wren replied that while the goal is to hire from within the community, the area for the existing program is managed by a

parent company, PCS, which hires employees. He was not certain how many of the current ambassadors were from the surrounding community. Ms. Reed advised that while she is typically in favor of hiring from within the community, she did not feel this would be the best practice for the Ambassador Program.

Ms. Burrows asked if it would be possible for the Board to fund only the pilot portion of the program. Mr. Wren pointed out that it may not be economically feasible to go through the RFP process for a program that might last only a short time. Mr. Brown recommended that the program be in operation at least one year.

Mr. Strawbridge advised that he could support the proposal if it is managed by the DDA and funds are provided on a reimbursement basis rather than up front. He pointed out that if the program experiences unexpected difficulties, the CRA would not be able to recoup funds provided up front.

Motion made by Mr. Strawbridge to recommend the \$250,000 amount, with \$100,000 to go to detail and \$150,000 to go to a pilot project to enhance the Ambassadors [Program] and that funds need to be procured and administered by the CRA Staff. [The **motion** died for lack of second.]

Motion made by Mr. Centamore, seconded by Ms. Reed, to accept [the program] as presented, with a few add-ons, including that they have to come back every month and give a report on what has been accomplished; if they feel as a Board that this is not successful, that they have a right to terminate it, and [the program] has to return any unspent funds.

Ms. Lagi asked which portion of the CRA budget would cover this particular program. Mr. Brown replied that it would be considered an operating expense. Ms. Burrows added that the Board does not typically provide funds up front for the projects or incentives it assists. Mr. Brown advised that the request must still be presented to the City Commission and the City Attorney's Office for approval before it can be funded.

Mr. Centamore asked if it would be possible to provide the funds on a month-by-month basis rather than up front. Mr. Brown stated that this would be determined by the City Attorney's Office. Mr. Centamore **withdrew** his **motion**, stating that he would like this and other questions answered before approving the program.

Vice Chair Phillips commented that the Board should consider refining its proposal to fund the program, including how the program would be administered, before it is sent to the City Commission for final approval. Mr. Brown noted, however, that it would not be possible to continue to re-hear various proposals such as the Ambassador Program as well as hearing development requests at the same meeting.

Mr. Strawbridge asked if it would be possible for the DDA to provide the CRA with \$200,000 so the CRA may administer the program. Mr. Wren stated that he would like to see the DDA's \$200,000 match with \$400,000 from the CRA for an expanded Ambassador Program as well as a Police presence. He also noted that the \$250,000 previously approved by the Board would have only covered Flagler Village.

Motion made by Mr. Strawbridge that the DDA donate \$200,000 and merge this \$200,000 with \$250,000 of Northwest CRA funds for a total of \$450,000, and reallocate that \$250,000 for ambassadors and \$150,000 for Officers. [The **motion** died for lack of second.]

Mr. Wren explained that the DDA's Board of Directors had asked him to request \$250,000, which was the amount the Board originally allocated to the Ambassador Program in Flagler Village; however, he confirmed that the program is more necessary west of Federal Highway than it is in Flagler Village. This would require more funds than the original \$250,000. He felt the program would need a total of \$500,000 to cover the area west of Flagler Village with both ambassadors and Police Officers.

Motion made by Mr. Centamore, seconded by Mr. Hinton, to approve the \$400,000, not to be paid up front, that would have to be determined by the CRA Board.

It was clarified that the DDA's existing Ambassador Program would merge with the program approved for the entire CRA, to be administered by CRA Staff. Mr. Brown noted that the CRA must make sure that it can administer a program that falls partially outside the CRA's boundaries. Mr. Wren explained that the DDA has contributed \$100,000 to the existing program, while the City has contributed an additional \$100,000.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 9-1 (Mr. Strawbridge dissenting).

It was determined that the Board would discuss the proposed \$100,000 for additional Police presence at another time.

VI. Mosaic Update

Mr. Brown reported that CRA Staff is working with the Mosaic Group on a marketing plan. Once this plan has been finalized, it will be presented to the Board.

VII. Streetscape Program – Discussion – Jonathan Brown, NPF CRA Manager and Bob Wojcik, Planner III, NPF CRA

Mr. Brown advised that questions have been raised by the City Attorney's Office regarding work within the City's public rights-of-way and whether or not a developer must send this work out for bid and provide necessary documentation. He noted that the CRA's incentive program is intended to cover work above and beyond Code

requirements and may not necessarily be spent on water or sewer lines. A decision on this issue will determine whether or not the Board may proceed with funding projects such as the Flagler Village Hotel, which was presented to the Board in June 2016.

Mr. Brown pointed out that the Board may need to shift their funding of this and similar projects from the Streetscape Program to the Development Incentive Program, which would allow the CRA to fund another part of the project(s) not located within the public right-of-way for the same amount of money. This would prevent any legal concerns from halting redevelopment.

Mr. Strawbridge observed that the intent of the City Attorney's Office may be to ensure greater transparency. He suggested that the City could secure an independent cost estimate and scope of the work being funded and ask the developer to pay for this work out of his/her own funds.

Mr. Brown explained that the CRA reimburses a development for work done based on the documentation that developer provides them. Mr. Strawbridge felt this did not sufficiently hold builders accountable for the dollars spent; if the dollars are tied to a particular piece of work, he felt an independent cost analysis could ensure that the expense is fair and equitable. Mr. Brown replied that if the Board feels this cost is appropriate, they may choose to fund an independent analysis.

Mr. Wojcik stated that the City Attorney's Office has previously issued a legal opinion that addresses this issue; recently, newer Legal Staff has re-evaluated the requirements of the program and has come up with 12 specific conditions that must be satisfied in order to allow the project to proceed. Some of these conditions cannot be satisfied for specific projects, particularly if the developers are smaller and work with affiliated agencies instead of operating as a single large company.

In order to support these projects, CRA Staff is considering moving support from one incentive program to another at the same level of funding. A 10-year mortgage is recommended on these properties to ensure the CRA can recoup its funds if the property is sold, foreclosed, or not in operation.

Mr. Brown stated that the Flagler Village Hotel will go before the City Commission on September 7, 2016, while the Quantum at Flagler Village project will be on the August 16, 2016 City Commission Agenda.

IX. NPF CRA Capital & Operating Budget – Jonathan Brown, NPF CRA Manager

Mr. Brown advised that Northwest CRA budget discussions at the City Commission level are still ongoing. Budget documents reflecting the tax increment financing (TIF) revenue projected for the CRA were provided in the members' backup materials. The

2017 budget totals slightly over \$9 million, including roughly \$28,000 in earned interest. Personnel expenditures include new CRA Staff that will be hired to administer programs. Office operating expenditures include rent and utilities, among other costs. Programs such as the Ambassador Program and Police expenditures are considered to be operating expenses.

Mr. Brown concluded that the document was presented in a simple format because the CRA Ordinance does not require a vote by the Advisory Board. Mr. Strawbridge recalled that the previous year, no Board member was willing to vote upon the budget as presented in a similar format.

Ms. Burrows asked why the Advisory Board no longer sees a full breakdown of the Northwest CRA budget when they had always received one in the past. Mr. Brown replied that he wished to ensure that the CRA is operating in a manner consistent with its governing Ordinance; knowing exact rent or salary costs, for example, has no bearing on capital projects, programs and incentives, or other CRA programs and their impact on the community. He reiterated that the Ordinance does not require a vote on the budget, although the Board may elect to vote on it if they wish.

Mr. Strawbridge asserted that he would reach out to his City Commissioner with his concerns regarding the transparency of the budget process. He recalled that the Board requested greater transparency following inappropriate manipulation of funds in the past, and that the City Commission had communicated its reliance on the advice of the Board. He concluded that he could not support the budget as presented.

Ms. Reed requested that the Board be presented with the percentage of the budget spent on each item, particularly in the operating budget. Mr. Brown confirmed that this could be done. He further explained that the budget includes transfers to the General Fund to reimburse City Staff members on loan to the CRA, as well as transfers on revenue bonds in relation to the Wave. \$3.5 million is set aside for business incentives, including those recommended by the Board and approved by the City Commission. Capital outlay funds are set aside for dedicated Police vehicles inside the CRA.

Motion made by Vice Chair Phillips, seconded by Ms. Burrows, to send a communication to the CRA Board that this Advisory Board has asked that this Ordinance idea that was [Mr. Brown's], that they be transparent in the budget so [the Advisory Board] can make educated, informed decisions about anything that they do, and they would like a breakdown of [the budget]. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Mr. Brown asked if the Board would like to recommend changes to the Ordinance itself. Ms. Burrows replied that a change was not necessary, but emphasized that because a full breakdown of the budget was not required by the Ordinance, this does not mean a full breakdown cannot be provided.

Mr. Centamore asked how the incentive programs could be used to encourage redevelopment when a significant portion of incentive program funding would be allocated to residential projects. Mr. Brown explained that assistance to developers was included under business incentives, such as streetscape, façade, and other programs.

It was noted that the budget provided to the Board members did not include a year-over-year comparison of funds spent on various incentive programs. Mr. Brown added that a member of the City Commission had expressed concern with the amount of incentives provided in the past; by breaking these down into two separate accounts, it allows the Board to gauge where the greatest interest in incentive programs lies.

X. Communication to CRA Board – NPF CRA Board

It was noted that Vice Chair Phillips' **motion** would be sent as a communication to the CRA Board.

XI. Old / New Business

Mr. Lagi advised that the incentive application is a single document that is applied to every incentive program. He pointed out that the single application requires individuals seeking small grants, such as the façade program, to fill out the same application more suitable for a major development project. He suggested that simpler grant programs offer simpler applications. Mr. Brown replied that the application itself is relatively simple, but requests additional documentation based upon the amount of funding requested. He confirmed that all questions on the application are not applicable to every incentive program.

XII. Public Comment

None.

XIII. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Any written public comments made 48 hours prior to the meeting regarding items discussed during the proceedings have been attached hereto.